



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

III. JUDGES x. 6—I SAMUEL viii.

IN the preceding section reference was made to the passage, Judges x. 6 sqq., which is not merely an Introduction to the story of Jephthah, but, by its inclusion of the Philistines (ver. 6 sq.), evidently has in view, also, the Philistine oppression in the days of Eli and Samuel. It commences a period of history which closes with the institution of the Monarchy, and the suggestion was made that in an earlier form it was immediately followed by the account of Saul's defeat of the Philistines and the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi, xiii sq.). The chapters which intervene comprise: (a) an account of the exploits of Samson (Judges xiii-xvi), (b) an Appendix to the book of Judges (xvii-xxi), and (c) narratives dealing with Eli, the guardian of the ark, and Samuel. Of these, the first affects Judah alone: Samson's deeds are neither the sequel to Jephthah's life nor are they the prelude to the work of Eli. Certain features (e.g. the Nazirite vow, family of Moses, mention of the Philistines and Danites) associate this cycle with the chapters that follow, but it must be recognized that, in spite of their extreme interest as examples of popular literature, they can scarcely claim to be considered as historical documents. The Appendix differs markedly from the rest of the book; it does not describe the exploits of any judge, but relates two incidents which were attributed to this age. The literary evidence suggests that it is a later addition to the book. The signs of Deuteronomic redaction which characterize the stories of the judges (ii. 6-xvi. 31) are wanting, and although this does not preclude the possibility that the chapters go back to an old source, the conclusion which the literary phenomena suggest must not be overlooked. Finally, in 1 Sam. i sqq., the whole account of the part played by Samuel must be treated with the greatest care. By the side of the older narratives which tell how Saul delivered the people from their enemies and thence became king, there are chapters which represent a tradition which can only have arisen long after these events occurred. Here we find Samuel, the theocratic head of the people, wielding an authority which makes the institution of a monarchy practically unnecessary. The desire of the people for a king is now regarded as an act of apostasy. That the age demanded a leader,

and that Yahweh himself had selected the man whom Samuel was to anoint, is ignored. To quote from Prof. Kent¹:

"Very different were the traditions cherished by the later prophets. The figure of an Elijah, an Elisha, or an Isaiah dictating in the name of Jehovah to king and people was on the one hand prominently before them. On the other, the evils of the kingship, as exemplified in the despotic, luxurious and—to their enlightened point of view—apostate reigns of such kings as Solomon and Ahab, were uppermost in their minds. To them the kingship seemed a step not forward from anarchy and oppression, as it actually was, but backward from that ideal theocracy which their imagination had unconsciously projected on the canvas of their early past. All Israel was conceived of as enjoying the benign guidance of the great prophet-judge, Samuel."

To this representation of history belong i Sam. viii, x. 17–25, xii, xv, and xxviii. 3–25, and there is little doubt that there are other passages wherein the tendency to idealize Samuel can already be discerned. That chapter vii, Samuel's great victory over the Philistines, is unhistorical, and appears to be based upon Saul's exploit—which it anticipates—has already been observed, and the entire account of the prophet's birth and consecration has all the appearance of having been superimposed upon the earlier and more trustworthy story of Eli². There is, in fact, much in favour of Prof. H. P. Smith's arguments that the history of Eli and the ark (i Sam. ii. 12–17, 22–25, 27 sqq., iv. 1–vii. 1) belongs to a distinct narrative which a writer of the life of Samuel has subordinated to his more interesting theme, and this theory will be found to explain both the unexpected omission of the commencement of Eli's life and the failure to narrate the subsequent fortunes of Shiloh and the ark after the return of the latter to Kirjath-jearim.

Whatever may be its historical foundation, the figure of Samuel as it has come down to us is largely the result of later tradition which has read into this great prototype the authority and power of the prophetic figures of subsequent ages. The recognition of this will explain the marked divergences in the narratives. As a legislative

¹ *Israel's Historical and Biographic Narratives* (London, 1905, p. 65; cf. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. xvi; Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 165 sq., &c.

² Kent, p. 51 (see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, p. 129). In like manner, the story of Samson's birth (*Judges* xiii) appears to be later than the account of his exploits. Verse 5 represents him as a forerunner of Samuel and Saul, and the chapter gives a different view of the hero of the folk-tales in whose deeds religion or religious motives are lacking.

"judge" his sphere of action is confined to Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah, and Ramah (vii. 16 sq.), scarcely an extensive district for the theocratic figure which viii, xii, and xv presuppose. Tradition believed that his sons, like those of Eli, were the cause of the people's complaint (viii. 5), but this is not supported by viii. 20 or xii. 12 (see also ver. 2). The narratives into which Samuel enters constitute the most important source for the history of early Israelite history. The old seer stands out like an Elijah or Elisha, and a comparative study of the three only strengthens the impression that tradition has ascribed to Saul's age the prophetic energy which was in full evidence several generations later. It is not until a later age that we again meet with the prophetic guilds of Mt. Ephraim, with seats at Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal, and it is a striking circumstance that these places are approximately the district associated with Samuel's activity, and that a guild of prophets is specifically mentioned at the unknown Naoth¹. Magic personalities (e.g. the witch at Endor), the conflicts with monarchy, the existence of a special class of *nēbī'īm*, the sporadic occurrence of the Nazirite vow—even the employment of music to excite the ecstatic condition, combine to form a picture which points forcibly to a period of an Elijah or Elisha. We cannot doubt that the prophetic associations of that later age had their own traditions, and that they should throw back their history to pre-monarchic days is scarcely a matter for surprise; Benjamin, as we know, became the religious centre of the land, but may we feel sure that it had already obtained this distinction by Saul's time? Accordingly, instead of assuming that these characteristic features of pre-prophetism died out and were revived later in the days of Elijah, or that the silence of the intervening period is accidental, and due to the fragmentary or incomplete character of the narratives which have survived², we may have to conclude that the narratives with which we have been dealing are not to be regarded as evidence either for the religion or for the history of Israel in pre-monarchic days.

The older chapters containing the account of Eli and the ark are among the most valued of records for the early conceptions of the attributes of that sacred object. We are introduced to the sanctuary of Shiloh where the aged priest is no longer able to restrain the

¹ 1 Sam. xix. 18-24. The name perhaps suggests a pastoral encampment, and in spite of its obscurity it is interesting to note that the early prophetism was opposed to civilization, and that the Rechabites were distinguished for their tent-life and general retention of the nomadic ideal.

² W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, pp. 1-11.

rapacity of his sons. With unusual detail their wickedness is exposed, and a passage (which may be a later insertion) proclaims the punishment that shall befall the priest and his house. Philistine aggression drove the people to arms, and when a defeat led the elders to bring into the field of battle the all-powerful Ark of Yahweh, this appeared to have lost its power, and was captured by the enemy. But no sooner was it in the hands of the Philistines than it showed its former superiority, until in despair they prepared to return it unto its rightful possessors. A further exhibition of its power at Beth-shemesh resulted in its being taken to Kirjath-jearim, and there it remained until the days of David. The notice in *i Sam.* ii. 27 sq. makes it certain that in the mind of the writer Eli belonged to the Levites who were elected to the priesthood. The priests of Shiloh were accordingly descended from those to whom Yahweh revealed himself "when they were in Egypt, servants to Pharaoh's house." Now, in the first of the two stories appended to the book of Judges, we hear of a migration of the Danites, of the founding and sacking of some unnamed sanctuary of Mt. Ephraim, and of the establishment of a priesthood at Dan under a grandson of Moses. This continued, it is said, "as long as the house of God was at Shiloh" (xviii. 31). In addition to this reference, there is one especially important passage which requires notice at this juncture. In *Num.* x. 29-36 there is an account of the departure of the ark; Moses invites Hobab to accompany him, and notwithstanding the refusal as reported, it subsequently appears from *Judges* i. 16, iv. 11 that a clan of the Kenites or Midianites finally settled in Judah. Commentators have not failed to notice that the attributes of the ark described in *Num.* loc. cit. find a parallel in the chapters of *i Sam.* under consideration, and one is tempted to believe that the three narratives in question belong to one and the same cycle of traditions. It is true that in the second story of the Appendix, the leading figure is a Levite and Shiloh itself enters somewhat prominently, but the character of the evidence does not appear to allow us to incorporate *Judges* xix-xxi also in the same series.

It might be conjectured that an old account of the foundation of Shiloh once stood before the story of Eli, and if this were the case, it is intelligible that it would naturally be omitted to avoid the contradiction with the later tradition in the Book of Joshua which would result. As far as the literary evidence is concerned it has to be noticed that the composite story of the migration of the Danites shows comparatively little trace of a post-exilic hand (*Judges* xvii. 6, xviii. 1, &c.), whereas the narrative of the outrage at Gibeah and the extermination of Benjamin in ch. xx sq. has been considerably re-

cast. There is a possibility, therefore, that the latter was added later, even as it would seem that the story of Ruth was not utilized until a time when it was too late to place it in the literature of the period to which it was ascribed. This assumption would enable us to point to the existence of two distinct series of narratives comprising (*a*) the older portions of Judges xvii sq. (and of xix-xxi ?), (*b*) the story of Eli and of the ark, and to conclude that to (*a*) has been prefixed a cycle of stories relating to a Danite hero, and that with (*b*) has been combined the story of Samuel's youth, thus filling up the period between Jephthah and Saul.

The narratives of Eli and the ark are of a unique type. Not only do we find that the ark has been silently established at Shiloh, but Shiloh has become the centre of worship. It is the seat of a legitimate priesthood whose corruption leads to its undoing. For its sins it falls; it disappears from the pages of history as suddenly as it appears; and, like an oasis in the midst of a desert, presents a striking picture of internal religious life in a period which is placed after the unsettled conditions under the judges and before the rise of Saul. It is, moreover, a period in which the Philistines have been enjoying the upper hand (1 Sam. iv. 9), when conflicts between them and the Israelites were frequent, and when the trend of history would have scarcely prepared us to expect the circumstances which the narratives relate and the conditions they reflect.

What is narrated of the fortunes of the ark among the Philistines seems to belong to some definite nucleus of traditions. Chs. v, vi are intimately associated with iv (the loss of the ark), and it has been assumed that the great defeat of the Hebrews which is implied by the story prepares one for the conditions when Saul arose. We are therefore to suppose that although the Philistines were moved by the power of the ark to the extent that they sent it back to the Israelites, they did not relax their oppressions, and that the lesson which the ark had taught them passed unheeded. But how comes it that the ark which had thus shown its supernatural power suddenly ceased to become the palladium of the tribes? For the character of the ark these chapters are of the utmost value; for its history they raise unanswerable questions. It is not until David's time that it reappears; Saul makes no effort to recover it; Samuel (whose youth had been spent in its shadow) takes no further thought of it. In 1 Sam. the ark takes up its quarters at Kirjath-jearim in the house of Abinadab, and only comes to light again after David had succeeded in taking Jerusalem. Here it is found at Baal-Judah, and after an incident at the threshing-floor of Nachon and a temporary sojourn at the house of Obed-edom it is brought into Jerusalem accompanied by every sign of rejoicing and gladness.

The serious difficulties which these narratives contain have given rise to theories which need not be discussed¹. David's unrestrained enthusiasm at the successful entry of the ark is not without its significance. That it remained in the house of an Obed-edom is suggestive also. Late passages (*Joshua xv. 2-11*, *i Chron. xiii. 6*), but *not* *2 Sam. vi. 2*, identify Kirjath-jearim with Baal-Judah, but there was a Baalah in the south of Judah and a Baalath-beer in the same district; on the other hand, this name is admittedly not confined to the south. When we inquire what light is thrown upon the problem by the earlier history, we have to note first the passage in *Num. x. 29-36*, to which reference has already been made, where the ark is associated with the journey of the Israelites to Hobab. Another old passage (*Deut. x. 8*) supports the view that it was borne by the Levites. To presume to fight without the sacred ark was to invite defeat, and on one notable occasion the people brought defeat upon themselves by their foolhardiness (*Num. xiv. 44 sq.*). But there is a curious gap here to which we must return immediately. It is true that we subsequently meet with the ark at the crossing of the Jordan and at the fall of Jericho (*Joshua iii. sq., vi. sq.*), but it is unaccountably missing in stories of greater national moment. It is not until the abrupt appearance of the priesthood at Shiloh that it appears again, and finally it is only after another strange silence that David brings it up into Jerusalem with every manifestation of relief.

The account of the defeat in *Num. xiv. 41-45* is particularly perplexing. The people were at Kadesh (*xiii. 26*), and terrified at the report of the spies, planned to return to Egypt. For their unbelief they were punished, and it was decreed that they should wander in the wilderness². Caleb alone was an exception, and for his faith he and his seed were rewarded with the blessing (*xiv. 24*). North of Kadesh, at a mountain (?in the hill-country), an attempt was made to push into Canaan, but the people were smitten down. Hormah, which is here mentioned, appears elsewhere as the name given to Arad after its capture by the Israelites (*xxi. 1-3*), whilst in *Judges i. 16 sq.* it is the name given to Zephath, which Judah and Simeon smote. In the latter passage we meet with the Kenites (*ver. 16*), and other traditions associate the conquest of the district with the clan Caleb. Thus, Caleb takes Hebron and his brother seizes Kirjath-sepher (*Joshua xv. 14-19*), whilst elsewhere (*Joshua xiv. 6-15*) Caleb reminds Joshua of the promise made at Kadesh and asks

¹ Kosters, *Theol. Tijd.* xxvii, 361 sqq.; Cheyne, *Encyc. Bib.*, s. v. "Ark."

² The details of the different views embodied in J, E, &c. need not be more specifically noticed at this stage.

that he may have the “*mountain* whereof Yahweh spoke” and hopes that he may be able to drive out the giants from its midst. The interest manifested in this clan has surely some significance, and it is not too much to infer that there are distinct traces of what might be called a “Calebite” tradition in the Old Testament. Who, save a Calebite, would write that Yahweh promised to Caleb and his seed the possession of the land? Subsequently, we shall see that Caleb is only one of several closely related clans of the south of Palestine, of the same general stock as the Edomites¹, and if the genealogical lists have any value at all it follows that to these southerners Moses’ kin and the Kenites undoubtedly belonged. Further, it is irresistible to avoid the conclusion which other scholars have reached, that after the events at Kadesh some clans actually succeeded in making their way into Judah, and we can readily understand that when these became incorporated with the Israelites, their traditions underwent serious modification. Hence it is intelligible why Caleb should have been enrolled in the genealogy of Judah, and why it is Judah who gives Hebron and Kirjath-sepher to Caleb (*Judges i. 10-15, 20*); also, why it is Joshua who apportions to Caleb his lot and blesses him (*Joshua xiv. 6-15*), and why the occupation of Palestine is regarded as the effect of the movements of the tribes from Gilgal (*Judges i-ii. 1*).

The oldest traditions begin with the commencement of the journey of the ark with tribes related to Moses (Kenites, Calebites, &c.), and they conclude with its triumphal entry under David (*2 Sam. vi.*). Was the ark the portable shrine which these tribes took with them to Jerusalem, even as the Danites were content to take a Levite priest and an ephod in their march upon Laish? Was it taken by David from some South-Judean Baal, and thence after a three-months’ residence with Obed-edom², conveyed to the capital? If the scattered indications have any value for this theory, it is evident that some light is thrown upon the traditions of Eli and the ark. It has been remarked that Eli himself was descended from the Levites, and the scribal families were of the Kenites and Calebites of whose cities Kirjath-jearim (*1 Sam. vii. 1*) was one. Furthermore, tradition knew of a Joshua of Beth-shemesh (“house of the sun”), the inhabitants of which rejoiced to see the ark. The place lay on the borders of Judah and Dan, opposite Zorah; and the name recalls Heres (“sun.”) *Judges i. 35*), but its relation to Timnath-heres (the tomb of Joshua) can only be a matter of conjecture.

¹ Cp. Caleb son of Kenaz, and see *Gen. xxxvi. 11, 15, 42*.

² It is only the Chronicler who makes him a Levite, but that the tradition rests upon a sound basis will be argued later.

The story of the migration of the Danites is familiar and need not be recapitulated. The tribesmen had their seats at Zorah and Eshtael, and Mahaneh-Dan (perhaps rather Manahath-Dan) seems to preserve some tradition of their presence. The first two places are elsewhere Judaean, and all three names are associated with the Calebites¹. This is important, not only because of the contiguity of the district with Judah's territory, but also on account of the prominence of the Calebite tradition elsewhere in this cycle of narratives. At the period when the story opens the Danites had no landed possession. Five men, representatives of the clans, were sent out to seek a suitable district, and from the gloss in Judges xviii. 1, we may infer that the only territory not already held by Israel and not too powerful to withstand them lay in the north. Laish in the neighbourhood of Beth-Rehob was found to be free from interference on the part of Phoenicians², and thither in due course six hundred fighting men and their households proceeded. Previously, the five Danites had passed by the sanctuary of Micah the Ephraimite, and had found that the Levite of Bethlehem, who was installed there, was no stranger to them. It is made quite clear that they recognized his voice (so one version), and that they were entitled to ask for an explanation of his presence. The narrative does not explain why this Levite should be known to the Danites, and were it not for the information supplied by the genealogies in 1 Chron. ii. 50 sq. (see below note 1), the question probably could not be answered; but it is possible that the statistical information referred to supplies an obvious clue, and that an intimate relation between Levites of Bethlehem and Danites was intelligible to those who recounted this story³. It is therefore significant that these Danites should request this Levite to consult the divine oracle on their behalf, and that subsequently they should carry off to their new home the priest and the sacred objects which he tended.

The story is one that might well appear to be fit to belong only to the pre-monarchic period, although there is evidence enough that the

¹ The genealogies in 1 Chron. ii. 50 sq. are now usually regarded as post-exilic, but the view is not an easy one. They include among the "sons" of Salma (the "father of Bethlehem") half the Manahathites and the Zorites. The Zorathites and Eshtaoletes are connected with the families of Kirjath-jearim whose "father" Shobal is a son of Caleb, and the entire body appears to have been akin to a branch (at least) of the Kenites, and to have numbered among them families of scribes.

² And Aramaeans—if we may read סָרָס for סָרָס in xviii. 7.

³ It may be noted incidentally that the Levite of Mt. Ephraim in Judges xix when he takes a concubine has one from Beth-lehem.

morality of the proceedings is not characteristic of this age alone. Hosea's scathing denunciations are sufficient to show that bloodshed and rapine were common enough in his days, even among the priests, and it seems open to question whether the Danite migration as described in Judges xvii, xviii really belongs to the particular period to which an editor of the Book of Judges has ascribed it. Do the facts, the conditions implied, and the character of the narrative, as a whole point to a date somewhere after the time of Jephthah and Samson and previous to the days of Saul?

The new home of the Danites¹, in David's time, was a minor Aramaean state (2 Sam. x. 6, 8), mentioned together with Zobah, Maacah (cp. Abel-beth-Maacah) and Tob, and situated apparently to the north of Lake Huleh. We know something of this locality, also, from the story of Joshua's fight with the king of Hazor and his allies (Joshua xi). Read in connexion with one of the two events now combined in Judges iv, it would seem that the tribes (possibly only Issachar and Zebulun) overthrew the northern confederation at the "waters of Merom" and scattered their opponents to Sidon on the west and the valley of Mizpeh on the east. The scene of the defeat appears to have been beyond Lake Huleh, and the "waters of Merom" (cp. "waters" of Megiddo, Jericho, &c.) probably denote some small stream². It is not unlikely that Joshua's great battle in the north is a reflection of a victory gained by David, even as his conquest in the south appears to have been derived from a recollection of one of Saul's achievements. It does not seem plausible to suppose that David conquered a district which had been Israelite and then reconquered by a Hadad-ezer, nor is it likely that the Danites after their migration were swallowed up and became part of an Aramaean state. On the other hand, it may not have been until after David's conquest that there was an opportunity for a tribe to settle in a locality which had become tranquil and peaceful, "secure and unsuspecting of danger"³.

Some of the prominent features of the preceding narratives may now be summarized. In the story of the Danite migration we are in

¹ Laish in the plain belonging to Beth-rehob (Judges xviii. 28).

² See *Encyc. Bib.*, s. v. "Merom."

³ From 2 Sam. xx. 18 (LXX, see Driver, Budde, &c.), it appears that Abel-beth-Maacah and Dan became places famous for the retention of genuine Israelite life. This is improbable, whether we believe that David overcame the Aramaeans of Maacah early or late in his reign (2 Sam. x), but on other grounds it has been argued that the conclusion of Sheba's revolt is due to redaction, and this would remove the present difficulty; see *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1900, pp. 166 sqq.

a period where the Levites are journeying through Israel to find homes and the Danites themselves are leaving Zorah and Eshtaoל for a district in North Israel which probably first became Israelite under David. The sanctuaries at Mt. Ephraim and Dan are possibly regarded with some contempt in so far as the proceeds of stolen property in the one case, and despoiled sacred objects in the other, constitute their origin. In the early chapters in 1 Samuel we have already noticed the sudden appearance of the priesthood of Eli at Shiloh and its equally sudden disappearance. Both Shiloh and Dan were destroyed at the same time (*Judges xviii. 31*), and Jeremiah's references to the fate of the former (*Jer. vii. 12, 14*) seem to point to a recent disaster. The same prophet evidently regarded the ark of the covenant as an object of little consequence (iii. 16), although in the course of the growth of tradition the importance of the ark increased. In one of the earliest writings we find it associated with a movement northwards, presumably from Kadesh, and from other evidence it would seem that the result of this journey is to be found in the presence of certain closely-related clans which were subsequently incorporated with Judah. The historical difficulties which are raised by the narratives of the ark in 1 Sam. iv-vi have been mentioned; on the other hand, the tradition embodied in 2 Sam. vi appears to furnish an appropriate conclusion to the history of its migration. Originally the ark was, perhaps, exclusively Judaean, and the contemptuous attitude of Saul's daughter (2 Sam. vi. 16 sqq.) may suggest that it was a strange object to a Benjamite. The passage is certainly obscure, but it is at least unnecessary to suppose that Michal was unaccustomed to exhibitions of religious fervour; probably it was not the form of the cult but the object of it which is to be regarded as the cause of her displeasure.

At this stage we encounter a difficulty which has to be faced, whatever be the point of view from which the history of the Old Testament is studied. The stories of the "Judges" are chiefly concerned with Central Palestine, and Judah and Benjamin enter only slightly into the history of the period. In *Judges xvii* sq., however, we meet with a Levite from Bethlehem whilst Danites are associated with Zorah and Eshtaoל and encamp at Kirjath-jearim. In *xix. sqq.* a Levite has taken a concubine from Bethlehem, and although Jerusalem is (probably by an archaism) regarded as Jebusite, Gibeah is in the hands of the Benjamites. Again, in 1 Sam. iv there are Israelites at Beth-shemesh and Kirjath-jearim, and the extent to which the district in general enters into the history of Saul need not be recapitulated. Now, from other sources we gain the following important facts: Jebus (Jerusalem) was a strong fortress which was first taken by

David, and there is no reason to suppose that it stood alone. Estates in its neighbourhood were given to David's sons and officers (Joab, Abiathar) and one may regard Jerusalem as the centre of "Jebusite" power. Elsewhere, we learn that Gezer, Mt. Heres, Aijalon and Shaalbim were not Israelite (Judges i. 29, 35), and that Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kirjath-jearim formed a confederation of their own (Joshua ix. 17). These places formed a series of independent towns stretching east and west, and until they were taken by the Israelites national union was impossible. The early history of Israel must have been largely determined by these conditions, and it is perhaps too readily assumed that the tradition which they represent is applicable only to the age of the "Judges." We know that Saul entered into a treaty with the Gibeonites, but even David respected their independence, and if the story relates that they became slaves to the "house of Yahweh" (Joshua ix. 27), this would mean that they were reduced to bondage and served in Solomon's temple. Gezer, too, remained Canaanite until Solomon's time, and it seems to follow that the stories in Judges xvii-1 Samuel, which circle around the district in which the above-named places lay, require a more critical study from a historical point of view.

One knows that the account of the conquest reflected in Judges i is at variance with that which characterizes the Book of Joshua. It is agreed by most critics that the latter gives us an unhistorical representation and that subsequent history confirms the *general* impression conveyed by Judges i. A more comprehensive survey of the earlier tradition for the history of the pre-monarchic period seems necessary, and in conjunction with it attention must be drawn to another important feature. In the annals of Solomon it is left to the reader to infer that David had overthrown the Philistine power, and so far the evidence of 2 Sam. viii. 1 appears to be substantiated. But whilst Solomon is said to have subjugated the rest of the Amorites, we hear little enough of the steps taken by Saul and David to overcome the non-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine. The trend of history would lead us to expect that the first two kings continued the work which Judges i proves to have been unfinished, and which Solomon himself completed. So far from this being the case, both Saul and David have to contend with a new enemy, the Philistines, and David's exploits in the vicinity of the Jebusite fortress are not with "Canaanites" or "Amorites" as might have been anticipated, but with Philistines. One may hope that it is not "hypercritical" to find in the Philistines of the books of Judges and Samuel another difficulty. We may accept the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and believe that they entered Palestine before

the twelfth century, and we may provisionally assume with W. M. Müller that whilst they occupied the central sea-board, their allies the Zakkara (Takkara) held Dor and the (Cretan ?) Cherithites settled in South Judah. In a word, we may admit the external evidence which appears to "confirm" the tradition preserved in the Old Testament, and, this being so, we must infer from the literary evidence that the Philistines settled among the Canaanites and became to all intents and purposes "Semitized." To quote from Prof. Moore¹ :—

"Of whatever stock and speech the invaders may have been in Palestine they very soon adopted the language of the country ; the Philistine names in the Old Testament and the Assyrian inscriptions are . . . almost without exception Semitic—specifically Canaanite. The Philistines worshipped the gods of the country also."

Although they must have mingled with the people and disappeared in it, yet, contrary to expectation, they emerge later and appear as an independent folk, with their own kings and policy. It is perhaps remarkable that these early invaders should have thus arisen again to form a separate state in the eighth century, and a closer study of some of the earlier references only increases the obscurity. After Samuel's defeat of the Philistines it is observed that there was peace between Israel and the *Amorites* (1 Sam. vii. 14). Of the five cities of the Philistines, three were held by the semi-mythical sons of Anak (Joshua xi. 22), giants like some of the Philistine heroes themselves, and it is noteworthy that Caleb drives out from Hebron the Anakim who appear elsewhere as Canaanites (Judges i. 10). The district south of Judah is occupied by Canaanites (Num. xxi. 1-3, Judges i. 17), Amalekites (Num. xiv. 42-45), Amorites (Deut. i. 44), and it is safe to conclude from yet another reference (Gen. xxvi) that the same district could be regarded as Philistine. Literary criticism has resolved some of the difficulties which are caused by these fluctuating usages and one is tempted to go a step further and regard with scepticism the use of the ethnic "Philistine" throughout the earlier history. Is it possible that in some cases the term is characteristic of a literary circle (cp. the use of "Canaanite," "Amorite") and really denotes the non-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine, whilst, in others, tradition has thrown back incidents which rightfully belong to a period a century or two later? On the strength of the Egyptian evidence, it would seem that the actual name is correct, but it does not follow therefore that it was always confined to the descendants of the Purusati who must have become merged with the Canaanites by the time of

¹ *Encyc. Bib.*, s. v. "Philistines," § 12.

Saul¹. There appears to have been frequent intercourse between the southern sea-coast of Palestine and the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean throughout the whole of the Old Testament period, and it is possible that foreigners, from Greece or Asia Minor, might have been regarded as of the same race as the original Purusati. There are obscure allusions to the Philistines in the days of Nadab (1 Kings xv. 27) and Elah (ib. xvi. 15 sqq.), that dark period in the history of Israel on which the records throw so little light. It was an age when, as the Homeric poems show, there were relations between Palestine and the lands of the Levant, and it will be remembered that later tradition knew of Greek intercourse with Dor and Gaza. The subsequent features of Palestinian archaeology *may* imply that at this time a new settlement arose in Southern Palestine, but most weight must be laid upon the appearance of the separate Philistine states in the eighth century, of which the Assyrian inscriptions have much to tell us. One of the most perplexing phenomena of the eighth century is the picture of the Philistine power which the cuneiform evidence has presented to us, and of the two possibilities: (a) the resurrection of the people with whom Saul and David contended, (b) an invasion of an alien stock (in the time of Nadab and Elah ?), the latter seems to deserve further consideration.

STANLEY A. COOK.

¹ It is even questionable from the Egyptian data whether the Purusati, after the great defeat inflicted upon them by Ramses III, were able to make any considerable impression upon the population of Palestine. Possibly it is only because of the representation in the books of Samuel that the contrary assumption has been made.

(*To be continued.*)